1

2

3 4

5

7

6

8 9

10 11

13 14

12

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

VICTOR CAMARGO JUAREZ,

٧.

Plaintiff,

TACO BELL, et al., Defendants. Case No. 3:24-cv-00462-MMD-CLB

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Victor Camargo Juarez sued his former employer, Defendants Taco Bell and Diversified Restaurant Group LLC, for discrimination and a hostile work environment in violation of federal law. (ECF No. 1-1.) The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint (ECF Nos. 7, 8), and he did (ECF No. 10 ("FAC")). Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of United States Magistrate Judge Carla Baldwin (ECF No. 11), screening the FAC, recommending that Plaintiff's sexual harassment hostile work environment claim proceed, but recommending dismissal with leave to amend of Plaintiff's putative Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") claim. To date, no objections to the R&R have been filed. For this reason, and as further explained below, the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is satisfied that Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. See United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) ("De novo review of the magistrate judges' findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations." (emphasis in original)). Judge Baldwin first recommends that Plaintiff's Title VII hostile work environment claim alleging sexual harassment proceed because, in the FAC, Plaintiff "alleges sufficient facts to establish that the sexual conduct he experienced at work was severe or pervasive such that [Plaintiff's] working

environment was altered." (ECF No. 11 at 4.) Judge Baldwin next recommends dismissing Plaintiff's putative ADA claim, but granting him leave to amend within 30 days, because he does not identify his actual or perceived disability in the FAC. (*Id.* at 4-6.) Having reviewed the R&R, Judge Baldwin did not clearly err.

It is therefore ordered that Judge Baldwin's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 11) is accepted and adopted in full.

It is further ordered that Plaintiff is proceeding on his hostile work environment claim described in the FAC (ECF No. 10).

It is further ordered that Plaintiff's ADA claim also alleged in his FAC (ECF No. 10) is dismissed, without prejudice and with leave to amend.

It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff chooses to file a second amended complaint curing the deficiencies of the ADA claim in his FAC as outlined in the R&R, Plaintiff must file that second amended complaint within 30 days from the date of entry of this order.

It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff does not timely file a second amended complaint in line with this order, Plaintiff will be proceeding on his hostile work environment claim only.

DATED THIS 11th Day of February 2025.

MIRANDA M. DU

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE